

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 600

CE 002 695

AUTHOR Gardner, Albert H.
TITLE A Report on the Baltimore City Public Schools' Workshop for Teachers of Disadvantaged Vocational Students.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park.
PUB DATE Sep 74
NOTE 22p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Course Evaluation; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Summer Workshops; *Teacher Workshops; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Maryland

ABSTRACT

The document is a report on the goals, activities, and consultant topics for a three-week vocational education workshop for 29 teachers of disadvantaged students in Baltimore. The workshop, in session five hours each day for lectures, discussion groups, consultant visits, and individual work sessions and conferences, had eight goals for teachers (becoming sensitive to problems of disadvantaged students, recognizing more than one value system for behavior, studying applications of innovative educational techniques, using effective instructional methods for slow learners, following procedures to minimize causes of discipline problems, developing instruction units to assist vocational school students, generating cooperation for a greater relationship between shop and academic studies, and writing program objectives behaviorally). Participants' evaluations of workshop goals, teaching staff, and resource personnel, rated on a four point scale (excellent, good, fair, poor), are tabulated and discussed. Fifteen recommendations to be used in planning other workshops and plans for follow-up sessions conclude the report. Appendixes list workshop participants and resource personnel. (NH)

ED 099600

A REPORT ON THE BALTIMORE CITY PUBLIC
SCHOOLS' WORKSHOP FOR TEACHERS
OF DISADVANTAGED VOCATIONAL
STUDENTS

SUMMER 1974

Submitted by

Dr. Albert H. Gardner

Associate Professor, Institute for Child Study

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

University of Maryland, College Park

September 1974

ABSTRACT

A report on the goals, activities, and consultant topics for a vocational education workshop for teachers of disadvantaged students in Baltimore, Maryland. Includes participant evaluation of the workshop goals and staff members. Recommendations for other workshops and plans for follow-up sessions conclude the report.

INTRODUCTION

The vocational teacher workshop was planned through the combined efforts of the Vocational Division of the Baltimore City Public Schools and the Department of Special Education and the Institute for Child Study of the University of Maryland. This workshop, in part, was a continuation of the workshops which have been received with success during the summers of 1971, 1972, and 1973.

WORKSHOP GOALS

The eight goals for the workshop were developed through the efforts of Dr. Benjamin Whitten, Area Superintendent for Vocational Education and representatives from each of the involved Departments of the University of Maryland.

These goals were:

1. Teachers will become sensitive to the problems of disadvantaged students.
2. Teachers will recognize that there is more than one value system for behavior.
3. Teachers will study and plan application of innovative educational techniques.
4. Teachers will know and be able to use effective instructional methods with the learning needs of slow learners.
5. Teachers will know and follow procedures that will tend to minimize the causes of discipline problems in the classroom.
6. Teachers will study curriculum materials and develop units of instruction which will assist the student to be successful in vocational school.
7. Teachers will cooperate so that a greater relationship is attained between the shop and academic studies.
8. Teachers will be able to write their program objectives behaviorally.

PARTICIPANTS

The workshop included 29 participants, representing eight schools in Baltimore City (see Appendix A). The participants were teachers of both vocational and academic subjects, and were identified and recommended by the Baltimore Public School System.

TEACHING STAFF

The teaching staff consisted of two persons: Dr. Albert H. Gardner, Associate Professor of Human Development Education, University of Maryland, and Mr. Raymond S. Peters, Training Problem Resource Specialist, Prince Georges County Schools. Mr. Peters represented the Special Education Department of the University of Maryland.

Dr. Gardner served as the workshop director; he was also a member of the teaching staff in the three previous workshops.

WORKSHOP FORMAT

The workshop was in session for five hours each day during the three-week period of July 1-19. Participants earned three hours of academic credit from the University of Maryland (either EDHD or EDSP 498 listing) for meeting the requirements of attendance, participation, and completion of the assigned curriculum unit. A follow-up session, to be held in Baltimore during the 1974-75 academic year under the direction of the University of Maryland staff, was part of the workshop planning (16 contact hours, one-hour of academic credit for participants).

The activities of the workshop included lectures, small and large group discussion groups, consultant visits, small group and individual work sessions, and individual conferences.

A major focus of the workshop was the development by each participant, or in some instances two or three participants working together, of a curriculum unit for classroom use during the coming school year. These units included behavioral objectives, activities, materials and resources.

The last day of the workshop was used as a time for sharing in which participants explained their curriculum units to the class. Mrs. Sidney Geister and Mr. Paul Harris, supervisors in the Vocational Education Area of the Baltimore City Schools, attended the morning session of this sharing activity. A copy of each unit was given to the Vocational Education Area for the purpose of assisting other teachers. There was widespread agreement on the value of the presentation and sharing of units.

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP

An important component of the workshop was participant evaluation of the stated goals, the teaching staff, and the resource personnel. The evaluation provided information which was used during the workshop, and data which could be helpful in planning other workshops. Formal rating procedures were used in all but the evaluation of the end of the first week.

First Week Evaluation. An informal "rap" session was held at the end of the first week of the workshop. Participants and staff discussed their perceptions of the format and progress of the workshop up until that time.

Second Week Evaluation. At the end of the second week participants rated nine objectives that the teaching staff felt to be desirable outcomes of the workshop at that point. These objectives, which appear below, were

rated on a four point scale: 4, excellent; 3, good; 2, fair; and 1, poor.

1. I have been able to identify myself as a participant in the large group discussion sessions.
2. I have been able to identify myself as a participant in the small group discussion sessions.
3. I have evaluated my values and attitudes which I hold and believe in as a teacher.
4. I have gained the security to risk exposing my attitudes and values by understanding other people in the workshop.
5. I can identify a variety of vocational oriented approaches to meet the educational needs of disadvantaged students.
6. I can identify a number of teaching strategies that can help me meet the needs of my students.
7. I am more familiar with resources I can call upon in meeting the needs of my students.
8. I know how to develop instructional materials.
9. I am more aware of the needs of my students and the strengths they bring with them.

The responses to these objectives are presented in Table I. It can be seen that the participants rated their accomplishments in a positive way with "excellent" and "good" ratings predominating; mean averages above 3.0 were found on eight of the nine objectives.

TABLE I

Participants' Rating of Second Week's Objectives

Objective	Rating Scale Frequencies				N	$\bar{X}$
	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)		
1 Large Group Discussions	13	11	4	1	29	3.2
2 Small Group Discussions	16	9	4	0	29	3.4
3 Evaluate Values	16	12	1	0	29	3.5
4 Understanding Others	13	9	6	0	28	3.3
5 Vocational Approaches	8	13	6	2	29	2.9
6 Teaching Strategies	15	8	6	0	29	3.3
7 Resources	15	5	8	1	29	3.2
8 Instructional Materials	15	8	5	1	29	3.3
9 Needs of Students	13	6	7	1	27	3.1

Evaluation of Workshop Goals. On the last day of the workshop each of the eight stated goals (page 1) were rated by the participants on a four-point scale according to the success of the workshop in attaining that goal. The results of these ratings are summarized in Table II.

The mean ratings indicate rather strong agreement among most of the participants on the success of the workshop with ratings at or above 3.5 on most goals. Only one item, "to minimize causes of discipline problems," with a mean score of 3.0, departs from this pattern. It is anticipated that special attention will be given to this goal in the follow-up sessions.

TABLE II
Participants' Rating of the Success
of the Workshop in
Achieving its Goals

Goal	Rating Scale Frequencies				N	$\bar{X}$
	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)		
1 Sensitivity	17	10	0	0	27	3.6
2 Value System	20	6	1	0	27	3.7
3 Techniques	19	7	1	0	27	3.7
4 Methods	17	7	3	0	27	3.5
5 Discipline	10	10	5	2	27	3.0
6 Instructional Units	18	8	1	0	27	3.6
7 Shop and Academic	16	7	4	0	27	3.4
8 Behavioral Objectives	19	8	0	0	27	3.7

Evaluation of Teaching Staff. The final evaluation form also included a section for the participants to evaluate the teaching staff. Five criteria were used:

1. The knowledge of subject matter, resource information, and subject areas.
2. Methodology used in presentations or working with small groups, individuals or the total group.
3. Planning of the Workshop to enable maximum use of student (teacher) time in the workshop.
4. An understanding and sensitivity to the problems of teachers in the workshop.
5. Planning of the workshop to provide for maximum participant involvement.

Table III contains the results of the teaching staff evaluation using a four-point scale. The mean score for the five criteria range from 3.4 to 3.7, suggesting favorable perceptions of this component of the workshop.

TABLE III

Evaluation of the Teaching Staff

Categories	Rating Scale Frequencies				N	$\bar{X}$
	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)		
1 Subject Matter	17	9	0	0	26	3.4
2 Methodology	18	8	1	0	27	3.6
3 Participant Time	18	9	0	0	27	3.7
4 Sensitivity	18	8	1	0	27	3.6
5 Participant Involvement	19	8	0	0	27	3.7

Rating of Resource Personnel. During the course of the workshop eight consultants (resource personnel) were invited to give presentations on the following topics: curriculum planning, innovative techniques in special education, learning packages, reading (materials and diagnosis), special education, drugs, and sex education. The names of the resource personnel may be found in Appendix B.

The resource personnel were rated (four-point scale) in terms of their knowledge about the subject, presentation methodology, and usefulness to participants. Participants were also to indicate "Yes" or "No" to recommending continued inclusion of the various consultants. The results of these responses are presented in Table IV. The mean ratings were relatively high, i.e., at 3.0 or above, in all but "innovative techniques" and "reading-diagnosis."

TABLE IV

Rating of Resource Personnel						
Rating Scale Frequencies						
Topic	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	N	$\bar{X}$
Curriculum Planning						
Knowledge	15	13	1	0	29	3.5
Presentation	9	9	6	4	28	2.8
Usefulness	9	8	8	2	27	2.9
Recommend Unit?	Yes <u>22</u>	No <u>7</u>				
Innovative Techniques						
Knowledge	8	6	8	3	25	2.8
Presentation	10	5	6	5	26	2.8
Usefulness	7	3	6	8	24	2.4
Recommend Unit?	Yes <u>13</u>	No <u>11</u>				
Learning Packages						
Knowledge	25	4	0	0	29	3.9
Presentation	25	4	0	0	29	3.9
Usefulness	21	5	2	0	28	3.7
Recommend Unit?	Yes <u>29</u>	No <u>0</u>				
Reading-Materials						
Knowledge	20	5	2	0	27	3.7
Presentation	11	10	8	0	29	3.1
Usefulness	10	15	3	0	28	3.2
Recommend Unit?	Yes <u>25</u>	No <u>3</u>				
Reading-Diagnosis						
Knowledge	10	11	6	0	27	3.1
Presentation	5	8	13	2	28	2.6
Usefulness	6	9	6	4	25	2.7
Recommend Unit?	Yes <u>17</u>	No <u>9</u>				
Special Education						
Knowledge	15	7	4	0	26	3.4
Presentation	12	7	6	2	27	3.1
Usefulness	13	5	6	3	27	3.0
Recommend Unit?	Yes <u>19</u>	No <u>7</u>				
Drugs						
Knowledge	19	7	1	0	27	3.7
Presentation	12	13	2	0	27	3.4
Usefulness	14	9	1	3	27	3.2
Recommend Unit?	Yes <u>22</u>	No <u>3</u>				
Sex Education						
Knowledge	21	6	0	0	27	3.8
Presentation	18	8	1	0	27	3.6
Usefulness	17	8	2	0	27	3.5
Recommend Unit?	Yes <u>25</u>	No <u>2</u>				

Overall Workshop Rating. The participants' rating of the total workshop was on a five-point scale: 5, excellent; 4, good; 3, adequate; 2, poor; and 1, very poor. A summary of these ratings appears in Table V. It can be seen that 27 of the 28 responses were either "excellent" (19) or "good" (8); one person chose the "adequate" category. The mean rating was 4.6.

Another item asked the participants to respond "Yes" or "No" if they would recommend the workshop to a friend. All 27 responses to this item were in the "Yes" choice (Table V).

Reasons given by the participants for these favorable responses included:

1. Allowed me to get help when it was needed, and to organize my work for the coming year.
2. More aware of "special" problems that hinder learning, and how to cope.
3. Learned more ways of solving the educational needs of my students.
4. Everyone imparted some part of himself.
5. Good rapport and exchange of thought and ideas between the participants.
6. Helped to improve the relationship between shop and academic areas.
7. Relaxed working conditions.
8. Methodology of instructors; they were involved and had good rapport with the group.
9. Understanding and sensitivity of the instructors to the problems of teachers.
10. I know how to set up units for my subject area.
11. Materials were available for us to work with.
12. Individual instruction was given.
13. Excellent methods for evaluation of the workshop were used.

14. The sharing of units to summarize the workshop.

TABLE V

Overall Workshop Rating			
Rating	Value	Frequency	$\bar{X}$
Excellent	5	19	
Good	4	8	
Adequate	3	1	
Poor	2	0	
Very Poor	1	0	
		<u>N = 28</u>	4.6

(I would recommend this workshop to a friend. Yes 27 No 0)

RECOMMENDATIONS

There was space on the evaluation form for participants to make recommendations to be used in planning other workshops. These recommendations included the following:

1. A detailed outline of activities is needed.
2. Better organization in terms of what is expected of participants.
3. More actual instruction.
4. More time; three weeks was not enough.
5. Include more teachers in similar workshops.
6. Start planning for workshop in January.
7. Slow-learner students be included in some sessions.
8. More information on characteristics of slow-learners.
9. Funding for miscellaneous supplies; more resource material for use in classroom.
10. Better facilities.
11. More Black lecturers.
12. Field trips to various centers and schools.
13. Include academic and vocational counselors; also a Math or English department head.
14. More time for presenting curriculum units.
15. Repeat the workshop each year.

FOLLOW-UP SESSIONS

A series of eight monthly two-hour meetings has been planned for September 1974 through April 1975 as a follow-up to the summer workshop. The sessions will be held in different vocational schools in Baltimore City.

Participants will: (1) develop evaluation procedures to determine if the various behavioral objectives have been met; (2) develop strategies

to implement the instructional procedures; and (3) develop means of assistance for those students unable to meet objectives because of special needs, handicaps, etc.

APPENDIX A

Participants

Lillian Allen
School 294
Reading

Cora Ashford
School 454
English

Jennifer Banks
School 40
English

Katherine Barnes
School 454
Cosmetology

Marjorie Bratcher
School 1A
Home Economics

Clara Brooks
School 454
Social Studies

Shirley Chambers
School 400
Business Education

Patsy Davis
School 454
English

Stanley Demski
School 294
Mechanical Drawing

Patricia Dickens
School 40
English

Eugene Dunn
School 454
Industrial Electronics

Patricia Gerald
School 454
Science

Stephen Goodwin
School 180
Bricklaying

Bertha Haskins
School 454
English

Pamela Heard
School 181
Home Economics

Lindsey Hill
School 454
Mathematics

Nadena Holden
School 400
Colt

Newavery Lawson
School 181
Cosmetology

Branson Miller
School 40
Blueprint Reading

Annie Mountain
School 1A
Home Economics

Lila Patt
School 454
Social Studies

Roy Patterson
School 40
Floor Covering

Minnie Reed
School 40
Industrial Sewing

Grace Richardson
School 181
Cosmetology

Melvin Rollins
School 454
Mathematics

Rose Smith
School 454
Cosmetology

continued - Participants

Vera Taylor
School 450
Business Education

Robert Walden
School 180
Floor Covering

Martha Ware
School 1A
Business Education

APPENDIX B

Resource Personnel

Dr. Lowell Anderson
Assoc. Professor, Industrial Education
University of Maryland, College Park

Ms. Charlotte Conoway
Vocational Education Division
State Department of Education (Baltimore)

Dr. Edward Doyle
Prince Georges County Schools
Upper Marlboro, Md.

Ms. Violet French
Reading Specialist-Public Schools
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Linda Jacobs
Director of Special Education
Anne Arundel County Schools

Mr. Connie McGuine
Agent, Drug Enforcement
U.S. Department of Justice (Baltimore)

Mr. Gary Probst
Associate Professor of Reading
Prince Georges Community College (Largo, Md)

Ms. Helen Thrash
Volunteer, Planned Parenthood
Baltimore, Maryland